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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Post title\* | Member Consultant for Final Evaluation of Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency phase I and II project (National Consultant) | |
| Project no | 00100586, Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency phase I and II | |
| Period of contract | 18 working days during August-September 2018 | |
| Duty Station | Jakarta | |
| Background and general information | **Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency phase I (2016 – 2017)**  One of the key lessons learned from the 2015 peat and forest fires is that suppressing fires on drained deep tropical peatland is extremely difficult, ineffective, and costly. The total economic tiss already estimated to be in excess of USD $ 15 billion (MoEF, 2015; CIFOR, 2015 and the World Bank, 2016). This does not include the loss of biodiversity, carbon emission and the irreversible long-term health impacts. Global Fire Emission Database estimated this event emits roughly 1,750 milllion metric tonns of CO2e.  Acknowledging this major lesson from 2015, the Government has concluded that prevention is by far the most effective way to tackle the fires, and concerted efforts should be made to that effect. Recent analyses find that fire vulnerability has increased over the past two decades, and that the government’s previous efforts have not yet been fully effective. Following this, fire prevention in 2016 and beyond will adopt a more anticipatory and systematic approach. The establishment of BRG is one key element of this strategy, initiated at the highest levels of government.  Through the Presidential Regulation Juni 1 of 2016, The Juni Peat Restoration Agency (Badan Restorasi Gambut – BRG) was established. The agency is mandated to coordinate and facilitate peat restoration of 2.6 million hectares in 7 provinces: Riau, Jambi, South Sumatra, West Juni, Central Juni, South Juni and Papua.  In order to prepare BRG to be institutionally ready to undertake its mandate, it requested support from international donors. The Kingdom of Norway has provided assistance to BRG that was implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). It then established the BRG Support Facility project.  Under this project, UNDP assisted and facilitated BRG with administration, procurement, financial and monitoring support to make it institutionally ready for facilitating and coordinating peat restoration efforts, harmonize national policy on peat protection and management through acceleration of the revision of Government Regulation Juni. 71 Year 2014, and develop models for peat restoration at peat hidrologycal unit (KHG).  The project was aimed to achieve the following objective: By end of this institutional set up support, BRG institutional capacity is in full position to coordinate and facilitate peat restoration and protection in the first year priority provinces and move forward to other priority provinces, and impact: BRG is ready to coordinate and facilitate peat restoration and protection. Three key components, i.e.: 1) institutional readiness; 2) Policy harmonization; 3) Peat restoration implementation model development, were implemented as an enabling condition and address the barriers in the early phase and deliver milestones results to achieve the project’s objective and impact.  Those three elements of project support have indeed constituted the three major outputs of the project, whose primary accomplishments are described below.  **Summary of Project Progress and Accomplishments: 2016 – 2017**  **Output 1 – BRG is equipped with the necessary components that will make tis effective institution to deliver its mandates**  Accomplishment under this output are as follows:   * Adequate staff provided to support administrative and technical matters for each of four deputies, head and secretary of BRG; * Provincial Peat Restoration Team (Tim Restorasi Gambut Daerah – TRGD) established in seven target provinces, and started functioned to plan peat restoration in the target provinces; * BRG expert group (comprising 24 experts in peat restoration, water management, humanity, social and economics) established and operationalized, providing inputs to the revision of PP 71/2014 on peat restoration, and providing inputs for BRG peat restoration strategy and policy; * BRG Working Units to manage administration and implementation of state budget established, with 11 out of 13 units were fully staffed during the first phase of the project; * Equipment provided to support daily working of staff; * Office space enhanced with additional space to accommodate the increased number of staff; * A five-year strategic plan that guide the BRG peat restoration implementation developed; * Peat ecosystem restoration plans (Rencana Restorasi Ekosistem Gambut – RREG) developed. The plans explain the specific location of peat hydrological units (Kesatuan Hidrologi Gambut – KHG) in all seven targeted provinces, describing their condition and function, and detailing any intervention to be undertaken to restore these KHGs; * With adequate staff structure and planning documents, BRG was eligible to be granted state budget. By the end of 2016, BRG was granted a total of IDR 24 Billion (USD 1.8 Million) in state funding for the last quarter of 2016. State funding for 2017 increased on a massive scale amounting to IDR 865 Billion (USD 64 Million); * To implement the strategic plan, BRG developed seven technical and policy guidelines that served and utilized as reference for peatland rehabilitation activities on the ground. * Technical guidelines on rewetting: construction of deep well, construction of canal blocking; * Technical guidelines on re-vegetation: seeding, nursery, and plantation; * Technical guideline on revitalization of community livelihood; * Policy guide on social safeguard; * Technical guidelines on monitoring the peat damage through the movement of water levels; * Technical guidelines on student field work (Kuliah Kerja Nyata – KKN) on peat care village (Desa peduli gambut – DGS). * To ensure transparency and accountability for its actions, BRG established a website and social media platforms to enable people to access information about BRG’s activities and achievements; * Complaint mechanism was also started developed in this phase and finished in the second phase of the Project.   **Output 2 – BRG’s inputs for the revision of Government Regulation Juni 71 Year 2014 on Peat Ecosystem Protection and Management is in place followed by the drafting of relevant ministerial regulations or decrees**  Accomplishment under this output are as follows:   * The government regulation no 71 Year 2014 has been revised to the government regulation no 57 Year 2016. The new regulation emphasizes on moratorium of any land clearing in the peat lands until the government stipulates protection and cultivation zone in peat ecosystems for certain plants. The stipulation will be details in the minister decree. The revised regulation also emphasizes on inclusive peat restoration that involve all stakeholders, particularly the community live surrounding the peat lands; * Following the revision, BRG set up a legal team in analysing existing regulations that may prove contradictory to Regulation Juni. 57/2016 and formulating recommendations on how to deal with those regulations; * On the other hand, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Juni Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan – KLHK) developed four regulations and two decrees derived from the new PP. They are:   + Regulation on inventory of peat ecosystem and determination of function of peat ecosystems, as mandated by the PP 57/2016. This will result in a final map of KHG in all target provinces that consist of detail location, space, biophysical characteristics, and functions (protected or cultivated zone) of KHG;   + Regulation of peat water level measurement management;   + Regulation on technical guidance of peat ecosystem recovery;   + Regulation on Industrial Plantation Forest (Hutan Tanaman Industri – HTI). This will particularly help the concession holders in cultivated peat areas. * BRG also conducted legal analyses and provided legal options to license holders that contribute to fire outbreaks in BRG targeted peatland restoration locations.   **Output 3 – The peat restoration implementation models are in place and serve as key reference for peat restoration undertaken by central government, sub-national government or partners**  Accomplishment under this output are as follows:   * BRG contributed to drafting ministerial decree on peat hydrological areas; * Five pilot activities involving national level universities (UGM and IPB), local universities (Universitas Riau and Universitas Palangkaraya), and CSOs (WALHI) conducted:   + Mapping of the canals and areas affected by canals in 7 provinces in Juni, conducted in collaboration with UGM;   + Action research on community-based peat restoration in Tebing Tinggi Timur Sub-district, Riau, conducted in collaboration with the Center for Disaster Study (Pusat Studi Bencana – PSB), Riau University;   + Peat-friendly cow cattle assessment in Pulang Pisau District, Central Juni, in collaboration with Bogor Agricultural Institute (IPB) and Palangkaraya University;   + Peat-friendly cow cattle in Pulang Pisau, a follow-up of the above assessment;   + Comprehensive Peat Restoration Modeling in Pulau Padang Sub-district, Riau, in collaboration with UGM.   **Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency phase II (2017 – 2018)**  The Kingdom of Norway continues supporting BRG to strengthen BRG institution through Office Support and Capacity Building Project (OSCB) managed by the UNDP. This project was considered as the second phase of the Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency. With similar impact and objective, the OSCB project provided three main components i.e.: (1) administrative support, (2) logistical support, and (3) capacity building support.  UNDP is implementing OSCB project for 12 months and prepare smooth transition to BRG. tis expected that by the end of March 2018, BRG will be in full capacity to carry over the activities under this project through a Project Management Unit or Government Mechanism. The capacity development of BRG will be achieved through the fulfilment of these indicators: BRG has recruited all essential staff personnel through state budget financing, number of agreements (MoU, community sub-projects, etc.) that are signed, and number of technical staff hired and number of guidelines prepared and adopted.  Three outputs are set within this project. They are:   1. Output 1 – BRG’s core institutional support functions and peatland operational equipment is established; 2. Output 2 – Strengthen BRG’s engagement with a wide coalition of stakeholders and its implementation of restoration activities; 3. Output 3 – Build capacity through provision of technical staff and guidelines that contribute to BRG’s technical capacity.   **Summary of Project Progress and Accomplishments: 2017 – 2018**   1. BRG Institutional and coordination enhanced through:    1. The enactment of Ministry of Environment and Forestry Regulation Juni. P.61/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/11/2017 on delegation of some part of Central Government on Environment and Forestry tasks on Peat Restoration to the Governor of Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, West Juni, Central Juni, South Juni and Papua, and followed up by development of technical and implementation guidelines and agreement between BRG and provincial governments – that enable BRG to disburse IDR 240 billion (or USD 20 millions) of state budget, and massive participation of sub-national government on peat restoration;    2. Intensive approach and discussion between BRG and Directorate General for Natural Resources Conservation and Ecosystem has result an agreement on implementation of peat restoration efforts in five conservation areas by DG- Natural Resources Conservation and Ecosystem Technical Unit Offices in five location – enable BRG to disburse its budget through government counterpart;    3. Establishment of Command Center at BRG Office – that enable BRG developing an Information Systems that support BRG’s internal work activities, coordination functions among stakeholders, monitor the progress of peat restoration and help the senior management’s decision making;    4. Establishment of Command Center at the Directorate General (DG) of Law Enforcement at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) Office – that will become main door for coordination between BRG and KLHK and help ease channeling feed up and feedback one another;    5. Expert Team review and recommendation for the refinement of government regulation, state budget utilization, internal and external coordination, partnership and participation. 2. BRG Implementation Capacity Enhanced through: 3. BRG mapping and planning improved by providing specific technical staff, so now BRG can produced proper annual planning instead of contingency planning; 4. Mobilizing Provincial Governments’ participation in Peatland Restoration by providing consultant to prepare necessary precondition such as coordination mechanism and guideline for the implementation of Peat Restoration in 7 provinces that will be undertaken under coordination of each of Provincial Peat Restoration Team (TRGD); 5. Mobilizing community participation in peatland restoration by providing special task force that conduct training on peat rewetting and revegetation infrastructure development to community groups; 6. Piloting peat restoration model at KHG level in Pulau Padang progressing well as all villages in one KHG are integrated and synergize to restore the KHG – this will make peat restoration effort effective and efficient, avoid overlapping, and result fair benefit to all communities living in one KHG. 7. BRG Engagement capacity enhanced through:    1. Acquire Juni commitment for supporting tropical peatland restoration through roundtable meeting involving Juni Peatland Society and Japan Peatland Society – this gives evidence based solution for peat restoration;    2. Establishment of dedicated communication team to enhance BRG communication strategy – ensuring more support from wider stakeholder.   As stated in the project document, before the operational closure of the project, an evaluation will have to be undertaken. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievements of project results, to draw lessons from the design and implementation of the project, and to recommend forward looking measures that will strengthen the implementation of other further UNDP projects. This evaluation will build on the first and second phase of the project covering the period of 2016 – 2018.  In view of the above, UNDP would like to hire an independent national or international consultant to undertake the project Terminal Evaluation. | |
| Objectives of Assignment | The main purpose of this evaluation is to systematically evaluate the relevance, performance and success of the activities undertaken by the project. It also shall examine achievements, good practices and lessons learned from the project to provide inputs to improve project performance and in order for the UNDP, BAPPENAS, Responsible parties, and the donors to learn from the project and to identify key areas which are replicable and the necessary conditions for sustainability.  The results and recommendations will be used by UNDP Indonesia as a basis to make mid-course corrections for the project implementation and for developing future programmes and interventions at the national, sub-national, and community level, in view of the continued cooperation with the Government of Indonesia.  The independent external evaluation will be conducted by a evaluation expert. The evaluation will assess the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project and will provide recommendations regarding the performance and impact of the project. As stipulated in the project document, the main stakeholders and, partners of the project are BRG, KLHK, communities and CSO involving in peat restoration activities.  Knowledge and information obtained from the evaluation will be used as basis for better design and management for results of future UNDP activities related to environment management and protection. The evaluation also supports public accountability of the Government of Indonesia, UNDP, and Donors. | |
| Scope of works | **Scope of Work**  The final evaluation shall examine progress, achievements, critical shortcomings, good practices and lessons learned from the project. This will allow UNDP, GOI and the relevant development partners (INGO, donor and others) to identify key areas that are replicable and the necessary conditions for project achievements and progress to be sustainable. At the same time, the evaluation is expected to analyze the results achieved by the project in view of the broader recovery outcome as stipulated in UNDP’s and GOI’s CPAP 2016-2020.  Within this scope of work, the evaluation shall cover all activities undertaken by the Project since 2016. The evaluation mission will have a full flexibility to employ appropriate approaches, methodology, and techniques in undertaking the evaluation – which are to be proposed to and endorsed by UNDP Evaluation Task Manager – including soliciting on stakeholders’ and beneficiaries’ perceptions, secondary data, government documents and project documentation, where applicable. UNDP Programme and Support Facility for Peat Restoration Agency Project staff will be available for consultation. The evaluation should ensure that beneficiary feedback is quantifiable and traceable where possible.  **Specific Objectives**  The specific objectives of the evaluation are as follows:   1. To review and critically evaluate the achievement of results since 2016 particularly at field level; 2. To review and contextualize project’s efforts and contributions to province and national efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emission; 3. To assess the relevance and effectiveness of strategies and interventions applied by the project at field level; 4. To determine whether there have been any unexpected results in addition to the planned outputs specified in the project documents at field level; 5. To gain insights into the level of satisfaction with the project’s results/impacts amongst beneficiaries (direct and indirect) and local partners; 6. To assess the project efforts towards ensuring sustainability to enable UNDP and project beneficiaries to sustain the benefits of the project and effectively respond to any future needs for institutional capacity support and development related to sustainable environment management and protection; 7. To distil and articulate lessons learned from the project, including those pertaining to approaches, strategies, gender mainstreaming (where relevant), management and partnerships, both in the context of location specific lessons and those relevant to other environment management and protection programmes; 8. To assess the effectiveness of capacity development at sub-national level and the extent to which this has contributed to overall improvement of sustainable environment management and protection; 9. To determine the added value of the project and potential replicability; 10. To provide recommendations and insights to future programming in the areas of support facility for institutionalisation, capacity building, policy advocacy, planning and budgeting, coordination and implementation, and monitoring and evaluation;     **Evaluation criteria**  The final evaluation exercise shall use the standard OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (For details see pages 168-170 of the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results: <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook>). In addition, other criteria to be used in this evaluation are value added and replicability. Based on these criteria, the selected consultants are expected to develop detailed relevant questions per criteria as outlined below.  **Relevance:** The extent to which the expected results of the intervention are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers responsiveness to changing and emerging development priorities and needs, and gender equality.  **Appropriateness:** Considers the cultural acceptance and feasibility of activities or method of delivery of a development initiative. Appropriateness examines whether the initiative as it is operationalized is acceptable and is feasible within the local context.  **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project’s intended results were achieved. Effectiveness measures the extent to which observed changes can be attributed to project activities and outputs.  **Efficiency:** A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, equipment, time, etc.) were converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produces the desired outputs.  **Sustainability:** The extent to which project benefits will continue after assistance has come to an end. This includes evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional, and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment making projection about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in future.  **Impact:** The measured changes in human development and people’s well-being brought about by the project, indirectly or directly, intended or unintended.  **Replicability** (for government, other development agencies and UNDP Indonesia): What successful interventions could be replicated in other situations and countries? What conditions need to be in place for the Support Facility efforts to be replicable in other settings? | |
| Evaluation Questions and Methodology | **Evaluation questions**  Evaluation questions must be agreed upon by the Project Board that commissions the evaluation.  The consultant will work in a team to develop a list of questions based on the criteria above and the following broad questions, which are the minimum that need to be addressed in this evaluation:   * What has been achieved and has this been done right? (Were stated outputs and outcomes achieved and were they done effectively and efficiently? Can success, or lack of it, be attributable to the project’s design, theory of change and implementation logic?) * Have the right things been done? (Were the activities, outputs and the outcomes relevant, appropriate and strategic to development priorities, national goals and UNDP’s mandate?) * Have the right things been done with the right people and partners? (Has the partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?) * What have been the benefits of the projects on individuals (men and women), institutions and the enabling environment? * Are the results sustainable? (Will the results be sustained by the beneficiaries and will they lead to benefits beyond the life of the existing project?) * What should we continue doing, what is replicable or can be scaled up, and how might we do things better in the future? (What lessons and findings are relevant for future programming or for other similar initiatives elsewhere?) * Has the project properly addressed crosscutting issues (like gender)? How might we do things better in the future?   **Methodology**  The team of the evaluators will design a detailed step-by-step work plan that specifies the methods the evaluation will use to collect the information needed to address its purpose and objectives. The overall approach and methodology should ensure the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions and criteria within the limits of resources (for more details see pages 172-177 of Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results: http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook).  The evaluation will consist of three main stages: 1) preparation and planning, 2) in-depth data collection, and 3) analysis and report writing.  **Preparation and planning stage (Both Leader and Member)**  **Desk review of existing project documents:** The evaluation team will review important primary and secondary documentation, including the Project Document (Prodoc), Results and Resources Framework (RRF), Country Programme Action Plan, project reports (Quarterly Monitoring Reports and Internal Project Assurance Reports), relevant government planning documents, donor reports, financial reports, project reviews, studies conducted by the project, training materials, etc. Introductory meetings with UNDP, BRG, KLHK, and the Royal Norwegian Embassy will be arranged.  Following the desk review, the evaluators will develop an inception report. An evaluation matrix should be included in the inception report and used as a reference in planning and conducting the evaluation. The evaluation matrix should summarize the evaluation design and methodology and should include data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated (For details see pages 199-200 of the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results).  **In-depth data collection stage (Member only)**  **Field visits:** Field visits to selected project locations will be undertaken, during which the evaluation team will use selected techniques and instruments for data collection that will enable them to respond to the questions in the evaluation framework (as indicated in a detailed evaluation matrix to be included in the inception report).  Suggested methods include:   * Direct observations * Semi-structured and individual interviews * Focus group discussions * Case studies * Questionnaires * Before and after comparison assessments (for example, in the context of planning and budgeting) * Stakeholder consultation   **Sampling:** The sample must be selected based on a rationale or purpose that is directly related to the evaluation purposes and is intended to ensure accuracy in the interpretation of findings and usefulness of evaluation results. Sampling criteria should consider types of activities implemented in the certain regions (Riau, Jambi, South Sumatera, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan and Papua) and quality of results. Likewise, the evaluators should develop sampling procedures for beneficiaries, which is a representative sample based on a rationale and purpose that is directly related to the purpose of this evaluation. A sampling plan and sample selection criteria (including size, characteristics and methodology) should be included in the inception report submitted by the evaluators. At minimum, stakeholders to be consulted should include principal beneficiaries, project board members, UNDP staff and management, BRG, KLHK, Norwegian Embassy and if possible other development partners working in the same field (such as the GGGI and UKCCU).  **Data analysis and report writing stage (Both Leader and Member)**  During this stage, the evaluation team will use the results from the data collected to answer the evaluation questions and criteria. Any additional consultations with key informants can be held at the national level during this stage. A debriefing will be held with project board members to present and confirm findings.  In the evaluation report, findings should be presented as factual statements based on an analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions and criteria. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced and highlight both strengths and weaknesses. Recommendations provided should be targeted, practical and feasible. The report should include a discussion on lessons learned, which should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report. | |
| Time Frame for Evaluation Process | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Activities | Time Frame | | Briefing of evaluators | Day 1 | | Desk Review and Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report | Day 1-2 | | Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report | Day 3 | | In-country evaluation mission (visit to the field, interviews, questionnaire) and contribute to draft report preparation | Day 4 - 15 | | Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance) | Day 16 | | Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report | Day 16 - 18 | | |
| Implementation Arrangements | The consultant will compose an evaluation team under the supervision of the evaluation manager. The roles of evaluation team and its relations vis-à-vis other evaluation stakeholders are described in the table below and in the management structure.  The evaluation team will consist of one international consultant as team leader and one national as member of the team.  The national consultant should possess the following competencies:   * Experience in monitoring and evaluation including demonstrated experience with program assessments; * A background in development; * Familiarity with monitoring and evaluation techniques including in-depth interviews; focus group discussions and participatory information collection techniques; * Strong analytical skills; * Experience in working with government agencies (central and local), civil society organizations, international organizations, UN Agencies, and Donors. Direct experience working in Indonesia is an asset; * Experience in evaluating projects, particularly on issues related to disaster management like DRR, humanitarian response, and post-disaster recovery; * Understanding of policy-making and capacity development issues in Indonesia; * Understanding of Indonesian government systems, especially policy and budget development at the national, district and provincial level; * Good interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills * Ability to work efficiently and independently under pressure, handle multi-tasking situations with strong delivery orientation; * Experience in leading evaluation teams. A good team player committed to enhancing and bringing additional value to the work of the team as a whole; * Advance proficiency in operating Microsoft office applications; * Fluent written and oral English.   **Table 1: Key roles and responsibilities in the evaluation process**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Person or Organization | Roles and Responsibilities | | Support Facility Project Board as commissioner of the evaluation | * Determine which output will be evaluated and when * Provide clear advice to the evaluation manager at the onset on how the findings will be used * Respond to the evaluation by preparing a management response and use of findings as appropriate * Take responsibility for learning across evaluation on various content areas and about evaluations * Safeguard the independence of the exercise * Allocate adequate funding and human resources | | Quality Assurance (DCD-P and Head of PMEU) | * Review documents as required and provide advice on the quality of the evaluation and option for improvement | | Evaluation Manager: M&E Analyst (PMEU) | * Lead the development of the evaluation TOR * Manage the selection and recruitment of the external evaluators * Manage the contractual arrangements, the budget, and the personnel involved in the evaluation * Provide executive and coordination support to the reference group * Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data * Liaise and respond to the commissioners * Connect the evaluation team with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluations stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation * Review the inception report and the draft evaluation report; ensure the final draft meet quality standard | | Reference Group: Representatives of the following stakeholders:  BRG, KLHK | * Define or confirm the profile, competencies and roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team * Participate in drafting and review of draft ToR * Assist in collecting required data * Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation * Review the draft evaluation report and ensure final draft meets quality standard | | Evaluation Team: One international consultant | * Fulfil the contractual arrangements in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and ethical guidelines; this includes developing an evaluation matrix as part of the inception report, drafting reports, briefing the commissioner and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations as needed. |   **Figure 1: Proposed management structure for Support Facility final evaluation**    **Annex 1: The Report should include the following headings**  Title and opening pages  Table of contents  List of acronyms and abbreviations  Executive summary  Introduction  Description of the intervention  Evaluation Scope and objectives  Evaluation approach and methods  Data analysis  Findings and conclusions  General Recommendations  Specific recommendations for replication within existing government institutions and programmes  Lessons learned  Annexes  The report should also contain boxes with case studies. | |
| Travel required | YES. The consultant is expected to travel to Pekanbaru, Jambi, Palembang, Pontianak, Palangkaraya, and Banjarmasin | |
| If travel is required | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **No** | **Destination** | **Frequency** | **Duration/days** | | 1 | Jakarta – Pekanbaru - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | 2 | Jakarta – Jambi - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | 3 | Jakarta – Palembang - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | 4 | Jakarta – Pontianak - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | 5 | Jakarta – Palangkaraya - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | 6 | Jakarta – Banjarmasin - Jakarta | 1 | 3 days (2 nights) stay | | |
| Category of consultant | Expert | **Education Qualifications:**Master’s degree or higher in sustainable development, environment management, forestry, or other relevant fields. |
| Working experience:   * A minimum of 10 years of experience working in environmental management, sustainable development * Experience in project monitoring and evaluation * Experience in project/programme design, monitoring and evaluation. * Experience in peatland restoration   Specific Skills:   * Ability and experience in implementing evaluation activity, and delivering high quality reports. * Excellent command of the English and Bahasa Indonesia language, spoken and written. |

\**A revised TOR and/or revised deliverables will require a new competitive process.*